arXiv:1610.06144v1 [math.CO] 19 Oct 2016

CONTAGIOUS SETS IN A DEGREE-PROPORTIONAL BOOTSTRAP PERCOLATION PROCESS

FREDERIK GARBE AND RICHARD MYCROFT

School of Mathematics,
University of Birmingham,
Birmingham B15 2TT,
United Kingdom

ANDREW MCDOWELL

Informatics Department,
King's College London,
London WC2R 2LS,
United Kingdom

Abstract. We study the following bootstrap percolation process: given a connected graph G on n vertices, we *infect* an initial set $A \subseteq V(G)$, and in each step a vertex v becomes infected if at least a ρ-proportion of its neighbours are infected (where ρ is a fixed constant). Once infected, a vertex remains infected forever. A set A which infects the whole graph is called a *contagious set*. It is natural to ask for the minimal size of a contagious set, which we denote by $h_\rho(G)$. Chang showed that if G has maximum degree at least $1/\rho$, then $h_\rho(G) < 5.83\rho n$, and subsequently Chang and Lyuu improved this result to the previously best known general upper bound $h_\rho(G) < 4.92\rho n$. Very recently Gentner and Rautenbach gave a stronger bound in the special case where G has girth at least five, namely that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and sufficiently small ρ we have $h_\rho(G) < (2+\varepsilon)\rho n$. Our main theorem solves the problem by showing that for every $\rho \in (0, 1]$ and every connected graph G of order $n > 1/(2\rho)$ we have $h_\rho(G) < 2\rho n$; a simple construction shows that this is the best possible bound of this form. We also give a stronger bound for the special case where G has girth at least five, showing that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and sufficiently small ρ, under this additional assumption we have $h_\rho(G) < (1+\varepsilon)\rho n$; we provide a construction to show that this bound is asymptotically best-possible.

1. Introduction

We study a graph percolation process in which a number of vertices are initially infected, and then, for a fixed constant $\rho \in [0, 1]$, after each time step an uninfected vertex will become infected if at least a ρ-proportion of its neighbours are already infected. Depending on the value of ρ and the choice of initially infected vertices, this process may result in the infection spreading to the entire graph. We are primarily interested in identifying, for a fixed graph and value of ρ, the size of the smallest set

E-mail addresses: fxg472@bham.ac.uk, andrew.mcdowell@kcl.ac.uk, r.mycroft@bham.ac.uk.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C69, 60K35.
RM supported by EPSRC grant EP/M011771/1.

that can be chosen to be initially infected which will result in the eventual infection of the entire graph.

This can be seen as a variant of the process first introduced as *bootstrap percolation* in statistical physics by Chalupa, Leath, and Reich [18] as a simplification of the Ising model. For a fixed $r \in \mathbb{N}$, they considered the process in which vertices become infected when at least r of their neighbours are infected, independently of their degree. Since then this case has often been called *r-neighbourhood percolation*. Besides its applications in statistical physics this threshold model was also used to describe problems in sociology, epidemiology, economics and computer science such as the diffusion of information and opinion in social networks, the spread of diseases, and cascading failures in financial or computer networks (see for example [13, 32, 33] and the references therein).

The idea for a degree-proportional model dates back to Granovetter [27], based on the natural assumption that an individual may be more likely to be swayed by finding that a significant proportion of their friends hold a particular view, rather than simply encountering a fixed number of people who have adopted that position. Sociologists call this process *complex propagation* in contrast to *simple propagation* in which one active neighbour is enough to influence a vertex. For studies investigating this complex model see for example [15, 14, 37].

Formally, we define the following more general framework. Let G be a graph and $\varphi : V(G) \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a function. For a set $A \subseteq V(G)$ we define a set $H_{\varphi,G}(A) \subseteq V(G)$ iteratively in the following way. We set $A_0 := A$ and $A_{i+1} := A_i \cup \{v \in V(G) : |N_G(v) \cap A_i| \geq \varphi(v)\}$. We call $(A_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ the *infecting sequence* in G induced by A with respect to φ. Note that $A_i \subseteq A_{i+1}$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, if $A_i = A_{i+1}$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then $A_{i+1} = A_{i+2}$. So for a finite graph G there must exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $A_k = A_{k+1} = A_{k+2} = \ldots$, and we set $H_{\varphi,G}(A) := A_k$ for this k. We say that a vertex v *becomes infected at step* i, if $v \in A_i \setminus A_{i-1}$, and for a set $S \subseteq H_{\varphi,G}(A)$ we say that A *infects* S. We now call a set $A \subseteq V(G)$ a *contagious set* for G with respect to φ if $H_{\varphi,G}(A) = V(G)$. In the literature infected vertices are also called *active* and it is said that A *percolates*, if A is a contagious set. Sometimes a contagious set is also called a *perfect target set* or an *irreversible dynamic monopoly*; the latter in contrast to the different process of *dynamic monopolies* in which active vertices may become inactive again as investigated in [35] and [12]. The special case of the constant function $\varphi(v) \equiv r$ is precisely r-neighbourhood percolation.

A major focus in recent years has been to determine, for various families of graphs, the critical probability such that an independent random selection of initially infected vertices is contagious. In an abundant line of research this problem was investigated for the multidimensional grid [2, 10, 16, 17, 30, 6, 8, 29, 5], the hypercube [4], the Hamming torus [28] and random graphs [11]. A prominent degree-proportional function φ which was investigated is the so-called *majority bootstrap percolation*, i.e. $\varphi(v) = d_G(v)/2$; for this function the critical probability for percolation was studied for the hypercube in [7].

Another research direction is the extremal problem of bounding the minimal size of a contagious set in the bootstrap percolation process. For a given function φ and a graph G we denote this number by $h_\varphi(G)$. In the case of the r-neighbourhood percolation this was again investigated for special families of graphs. Balogh and Pete [10] gave first bounds for the multidimensional grid. Recently the exact size for the hypercube was determined by Morrison and Noel [34]. This proves a conjecture of Balogh and Bollobás [4] and improves earlier bounds of Balogh, Bollobás and Morris [8]. Additionally, Morrison and Noel also proved bounds for multidimensional rectangular grids. Furthermore, the minimal size of a contagious set has been investigated for expander

graphs [21], very dense graphs [25], random graphs [31, 3, 24], with additional Ore and Chvátal-type degree conditions [23], and in the setting of hypergraphs [9].

A general bound on the minimal size of a contagious set for every function φ and graph G was provided by Ackermann, Ben-Zwi and Wolfovitz [1] who showed that

$$h_\varphi(G) \leq \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{\lceil \varphi(v) \rceil}{d_G(v)+1} \,. \tag{1}$$

This bound was independently also derived by Reichmann [36] for the special case of r-neighbourhood percolation. Very recently this bound was improved by Cordasco, Gargano, Mecchia, Rescigno and Vaccaro in [22] to

$$h_\varphi(G) \leq \sum_{v \in V'} \min\left\{1, \frac{\lceil \varphi(v) \rceil}{d'(v)+1}\right\} \,, \tag{2}$$

where $V' = \{v \in V(G) \mid d_G(v) \geq 2 \text{ or } \varphi(v) \neq 1\}$ and $d'(v) = |N_G(v) \cap V'|$.

In this paper we focus on general upper bounds on the size of a smallest contagious set in a degree-proportional bootstrap percolation process, *i.e.* $\varphi_\rho(v) = \rho d_G(v)$, where $\rho \in [0,1]$ is a fixed constant. Observe that if G is not connected, then a smallest contagious set of G is simply the union of smallest contagious sets, one from each connected component, so we need only consider connected graphs. Throughout this paper we will often shorten the notation of φ_ρ to simply ρ, so for example we will write $h_\rho(G)$ instead of $h_{\varphi_\rho}(G)$.

For majority bootstrap percolation (where $\rho = 1/2$), expression (1) shows that for any graph G we have $h_{1/2}(G) \leq |V(G)|/2$. This bound is best possible, as shown by taking G to be a clique of even order. However, expression (1) and also expression (2) may be far from best possible if ρ is small and G has many vertices of small degree. For example, for $1/n < \rho \ll 1$, let $K_{1,n-1}$ be the star on n vertices with partite sets $\{v\} \cup B$. We add a perfect matching to B and call the resulting graph S. Note that according to the notation of expression (2) we have $V' = V(S)$ and $d'(v) = d_S(v)$. Hence

$$h_\rho(S) = 1 < \rho n \ll \frac{n-1}{3} < \sum_{v \in V'} \frac{\lceil \rho d_S(v) \rceil}{d'(v)+1} \,.$$

For this reason attention has recently focussed on providing upper bounds of the form $h_\rho(G) \leq C\rho n$ for a constant C. Since the smallest possible size of a contagious set is one, in discussing this goal we restrict our attention to graphs on at least $1/(C\rho)$ vertices. This additional assumption is also a natural restriction of the problem we investigate, as any connected graph of order at most $1/\rho + 1$ can be infected by just one infected vertex and so in this case the problem is trivial. Observe that for $n := \lfloor 1/\rho \rfloor + 2$, any contagious set for K_n has size at least $2 \geq 2\rho n - 4\rho$, from which we derive the following observation.

Observation 1.1. *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\rho > 0$ and a connected graph G on $n > 1/\rho + 1$ vertices such that*

$$h_\rho(G) \geq (2-\varepsilon)\rho n \,.$$

The first general upper bound was due to Chang [19], who showed that any connected graph G on n vertices with maximum degree $\Delta(G) \geq 1/\rho$ satisfies

$$h_\rho(G) \leq (2\sqrt{2}+3)\rho n < 5.83\rho n \,. \tag{3}$$

Chang and Lyuu [20] improved this bound by showing that (under the same assumptions)

$$h_\rho(G) \leq 4.92\rho n \,.$$

This was the best general bound prior to this work. Very recently Gentner and Rautenbach [26] provided an upper bound which asymptotically matches the lower bound of Observation 1.1 under the additional assumptions that G has girth at least five and ρ is sufficiently small. More precisely, they showed that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, if ρ is sufficiently small and G has girth at least five and maximum degree at least $1/\rho$, then

$$h_\rho(G) \leq (2+\varepsilon)\rho n \ . \tag{4}$$

The first main result of this paper is the following theorem, which provides an optimal general upper bound for any $0 < \rho \leq 1$.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $\rho \in (0,1]$. If G is a connected graph of order $n > 1/(2\rho)$, then*

$$h_\rho(G) < 2\rho n \ .$$

The second main result of this paper is a stronger bound for graphs of girth at least five, obtained by combining our approach for Theorem 1.2 with the method used by Gentner and Rautenbach [26] to prove (4).

Theorem 1.3. *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\rho_0 > 0$ such that for every $\rho \in (0, \rho_0)$ the following holds. If G is a connected graph of order n with $n > \frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)\rho}$ and girth at least 5, then*

$$h_\rho(G) < (1+\varepsilon)\rho n \ .$$

Theorem 1.3 is also asymptotically best possible, as shown by the following example of the balanced $(\lfloor 1/\rho \rfloor + 1)$-regular tree.

Observation 1.4. *For every $\varepsilon > 0$, every $\rho_0 > 0$ and every $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\rho \in (0, \rho_0)$ and a connected graph G with girth at least 5 on $n > N_0$ vertices such that*

$$h_\rho(G) > (1-\varepsilon)\rho n \ .$$

Proof. Given ε, ρ_0 and N_0, choose $\rho \in (0, \rho_0)$ sufficiently small so that $d := \lfloor 1/\rho \rfloor + 1$ fulfils $d > \max\{2/\varepsilon, \sqrt{N_0 - 1}\}$. Let G be the balanced d-regular tree with root v of order $n := 1 + d^2 > N_0$, which consists of three 'tiers' $T_1 = \{v\}, T_2 = N_G(v)$ and $T_3 = V(G) \setminus (v \cup N_G(v))$, and note in particular that $|T_2| = d$ and $|T_3| = d(d-1)$. We will show that $h_\rho(G) = d$ and therefore that

$$h_\rho(G) = d = \frac{d}{\rho(1+d^2)}\rho n \geq \frac{(d-1)d}{1+d^2}\rho n = \left(1 - \frac{d+1}{1+d^2}\right)\rho n > (1-2/d)\rho n > (1-\varepsilon)\rho n \ .$$

First note that T_2 infects the whole graph G, so $h_\rho(G) \leq d$. On the other hand, observe that every vertex in T_2 needs two infected neighbours for its own infection. For each $u \in T_2$ write $T_u := \{u\} \cup N_G(u) \setminus \{v\}$. Then, because of our previous observation, every contagious set $A \subseteq V(G)$ fulfils $|A \cap T_u| \geq 1$ for each $u \in T_2$. Since the sets T_u are pairwise vertex-disjoint it follows that $|A| \geq |T_2| = d$, so $h_\rho(G) \geq d$. □

The next section is the main part of the paper containing the proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3. We conclude with the discussion of some related open problems in the last section of the paper. Given a graph G we write $n(G)$ for the order of G, and for any subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ we write $G - S$ for the induced subgraph $G[V(G) \setminus S]$.

2. Proofs of the theorems

2.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.** The underlying idea we use to prove Theorem 1.2 is the following. First, we suppose the existence of a minimal counterexample to our assertion and investigate its structure, categorising the vertices according to their degree in relation to ρ. In this way we can distinguish between vertices according to the

number of infected neighbours necessary to cause their own infection. Next, using the minimality of this counterexample, we derive several degree conditions; in particular we bound the number of edges between low degree and high degree vertices. Finally, we show that we can infect the whole graph by a certain random selection of vertices just among the vertices of high degree. This will contradict the existence of a minimal counterexample. Our random selection follows the approach of Ackerman, Ben-Zwi and Wolfovitz [1] used to establish the bound (1), whilst the idea of distinguishing between low and high degree vertices was used by Chang [19] to prove the bound (3). The principal difference in our proof is that our analysis of the degree conditions is more detailed, as we distinguish more classes of degree, and that we take advantage of the structure of a minimal counterexample. During the proof we will work with the following easy observation.

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose that $\rho \in [0,1]$ and G is a graph. Let $S \subseteq V(G)$ and set $G' = G - S$. If $A \subseteq V(G')$ is a contagious set for G' with respect to ρ, then $A \cup S$ is a contagious set for G with respect to ρ.*

Proof. Let (X_i) be the infecting sequence in G induced by $A \cup S$ with respect to ρ and let (Y_i) be the infecting sequence in G' induced by A with respect to ρ. We show by induction on i that $Y_i \cup S \subseteq X_i$ and therefore $V(G) = H_{\rho,G'}(A) \cup S \subseteq H_{\rho,G}(A \cup S)$. For the base case we certainly have $Y_0 \cup S = A \cup S = X_0$. So assume the statement is true for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $v \in Y_{i+1} \setminus Y_i$. We then have that $|N_{G'}(v) \cap Y_i| \geq \rho d_{G'}(v)$. We show that $|N_G(v) \cap X_i| \geq \rho d_G(v)$ and therefore $v \in X_{i+1}$. For this define $M(v) := N_G(v) \cap S$ and note that $N_G(v) = N_{G'}(v) \cup M(v)$ by the definition of G'. In particular we have that $d_G(v) = d_{G'}(v) + |M(v)|$. Since $S \cup (N_{G'}(v) \cap Y_i) \subseteq X_i$ by the induction hypothesis, we can deduce that

$$|N_G(v) \cap X_i| \geq |M(v)| + |N_{G'}(v) \cap Y_i| \geq |M(v)| + \rho d_{G'}(v) \geq \rho(|M(v)| + d_{G'}(v)) = \rho d_G(v) \,.$$

□

We can now turn to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We may assume that $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$, as otherwise the statement is trivial. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of counterexamples to the theorem for this value of ρ (in other words, $\mathcal{G}$ is the set of all connected graphs G with $n(G) > 1/(2\rho)$ such that $h_\rho(G) \geq 2\rho n(G)$). Suppose for a contradiction that $\mathcal{G}$ is non-empty (*i.e.* that a counterexample exists). Let $n = \min_{G \in \mathcal{G}} n(G)$, and choose $G \in \mathcal{G}$ with $n(G) = n$ such that $e(G) \leq e(H)$ for every $H \in \mathcal{G}$ with $n(H) = n$. Thus G is a minimal counterexample according to its number of vertices and (among those) to its number of edges. Note that $n > 1/(2\rho)$, and so

$$n > 1/\rho + 1 \,, \tag{5}$$

as otherwise every vertex v of G would have $d(v) \leq 1/\rho$ and so would require only one infected neighbour for its infection; since G is connected it would then follow that any vertex of G forms a contagious set of size one, so $h_\rho(G) = 1 < 2\rho n$, contradicting our assumption that G is a counterexample. The vertex-minimality of G will prove the following claim.

Claim 2.2. *For every $v \in V(G)$ we have that $|H_{\rho,G}(v)| < 1/(2\rho)$.*

Proof. For the sake of a contradiction assume that there exists $v \in V(G)$ such that $|H_{\rho,G}(v)| \geq 1/(2\rho)$. We set $G' := G - H_{\rho,G}(v)$ and denote by $\mathcal{C}$ the set of connected components of G'. Note first that $\{v\}$ cannot infect all vertices of G, as otherwise we would have $h_\rho(G) = 1 = 2\rho \cdot 1/(2\rho) < 2\rho n$ by our assumption about the size of n,

contradicting our assumption that G is a counterexample. So $\mathcal{C}$ is non-empty. Now assume that there is a component $C \in \mathcal{C}$ which contains at most $1/(2\rho)$ vertices. As G is connected, there exists a vertex $u \in V(C)$ with at least one neighbour in $H_{\rho,G}(v)$. Define $m(u) := |N_G(u) \cap H_{\rho,G}(v)|$, so $m(u) \geq 1$. Since $u \notin H_{\rho,G}(v)$, we derive the inequality

$$1/(2\rho) + m(u) > |N_G(u) \cap C| + m(u) = d_G(u) > 1/\rho \cdot m(u) \ .$$

As $m(u) \geq 1$, this leads to $\rho > 1/2$, which is a contradiction. Therefore each connected component of G' contains more than $1/(2\rho)$ vertices. Since G was a minimal counterexample, it follows that for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ there exists a subset $A_C \subseteq V(C)$ with $|A_C| < 2\rho|V(C)|$ which is a contagious set, that is, such that $H_{\rho,C}(A_C) = V(C)$. We then have $H_{\rho,G'}(\bigcup_{C\in\mathcal{C}} A_C) = V(G')$. Since v infects $H_{\rho,G}(v)$ and, by Proposition 2.1 we have that $\bigcup_{C\in\mathcal{C}} A_C \cup H_{\rho,G}(v)$ infects G, it follows that $H_{\rho,G}(\bigcup_{C\in\mathcal{C}} A_C \cup \{v\}) = V(G)$. Hence

$$h_\rho(G) \leq 1 + \sum_{C\in\mathcal{C}} |A_C| < 2\rho \left(|H_{\rho,G}(v)| + \sum_{C\in\mathcal{C}} |V(C)| \right) \leq 2\rho n \ ,$$

contradicting our assumption that G is a counterexample. □

We now classify the vertices of G according to their degree and set

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &:= \{v \in V(G) \mid d_G(v) \leq 1/\rho\}, \\ V_{\geq 2} &:= V(G) \setminus V_1 \text{ , and} \\ V_2 &:= \{v \in V_{\geq 2} \mid d_G(v) \leq 2/\rho\} \ . \end{aligned}$$

Note that V_1 is the set of vertices which become infected if just one of their neighbours is infected, $V_{\geq 2}$ is the set of vertices which cannot be infected by just one infected neighbour, and V_2 is the set of vertices which can be infected by two infected neighbours, but not by just one infected neighbour. Claim 2.2 together with the minimality of G will prove the following claim about the size of neighbourhoods of vertices in these sets.

Claim 2.3. *The following holds.*

(i) $|N_G(v) \cap V_1| < 1/(2\rho)$ *for every* $v \in V_{\geq 2}$.
(ii) The induced subgraph $G[N(v) \cap V_2]$ *is a clique for every* $v \in V_{\geq 2}$.
(iii) $|N_G(v) \cap V_2| < 1/(2\rho)$ *for every* $v \in V_1$.

Proof. To prove (i) assume for a contradiction that there exists $v \in V_{\geq 2}$ such that $|N(v) \cap V_1| \geq 1/(2\rho)$. If v is initially infected, then in the first time step every vertex of $N(v) \cap V_1$ will become infected. So $|H_{\rho,G}(v)| \geq |\{v\} \cup (N(v) \cap V_1)| > 1/(2\rho)$ contradicting Claim 2.2.

For (ii), assume for a contradiction that there are distinct $x, y \in N(v) \cap V_2$ such that $\{x, y\} \notin E(G)$. Let H be the graph formed from G by removing the edges $\{v, x\}$ and $\{v, y\}$ and adding the edge $\{x, y\}$, and let C be the connected component of H containing x and y.

We claim that every contagious set $A \subseteq V(C)$ for C also infects $V(C)$ in G. To see this, let (X_i) be the infecting sequence in G induced by A with respect to ρ and let (Y_i) be the infecting sequence in C induced by A with respect to ρ. We now prove by induction on i that $Y_i \subseteq X_{2i}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. The base case is given by $Y_0 = A = X_0$, so assume that $Y_i \subseteq X_{2i}$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider the following cases for each $w \in Y_{i+1} \setminus Y_i$.

(a) If $w \notin \{x, y, v\}$, then by construction of H we have $N_G(w) = N_C(w)$, and by our induction hypothesis we can conclude that at least $\rho d_G(w) = \rho d_C(w)$ neighbours of w are in $Y_i \subseteq X_{2i}$. Hence $w \in X_{2i+1} \subseteq X_{2(i+1)}$ as required.

(b) If $w = v$, then $v \in V(C)$ and by construction of H we have that $N_C(v) \subseteq N_G(v)$. Again since $v \in Y_{i+1}$, we have that $\rho d_C(v) \geq |N_C(v) \cap Y_i|$ and therefore by also making use of the induction hypothesis there exists $u \in (N_C(v) \cap Y_i) \subseteq (N_G(v) \cap X_{2i})$. Since $d_G(v) \leq 1/\rho$, we have that $|N_G(v) \cap X_{2i}| \geq 1 \geq \rho d_G(v)$ and therefore $v \in X_{2i+1} \subseteq X_{2(i+1)}$.

(c) If $w \in \{x, y\}$, then we may assume without loss of generality that $w = x$ (since the following arguments hold equally well with y in place of x). Note that by construction of H we have that $N_C(x) = N_G(x) \setminus \{v\} \cup \{y\}$ and in particular that $d_G(x) = d_C(x)$. Furthermore, since $x \in Y_{i+1} \setminus Y_i$, we have that $|N_C(x) \cap Y_i| \geq \rho d_C(x)$. Setting $U := N_C(x) \setminus \{y\}$, we first assume that $|U \cap Y_i| \geq \rho d_G(x)$. By the induction hypothesis $U \cap Y_i \subseteq X_{2i}$ and since $U \subseteq N_G(x)$ we have that $x \in X_{2i+1} \subseteq X_{2(i+1)}$. Conversely, if $|U \cap Y_i| < \rho d_G(x)$, then $y \in Y_i \subseteq X_{2i}$. Since $d_G(v) \leq 1/\rho$ and $y \in N_G(v) \cap X_{2i}$, we have that $v \in X_{2i+1}$. Furthermore $v \notin U$ and $U \subseteq X_{2i} \subseteq X_{2i+1}$. Hence $|N_G(x) \cap X_{2i+1}| \geq |U \cap Y_i \cup \{v\}| \geq \rho d_C(x) = \rho d_G(x)$ and therefore $x \in X_{2(i+1)}$.

This completes the induction argument, so we have $Y_i \subseteq X_{2i}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and therefore $V(C) = H_{\rho,C}(A) \subseteq H_{\rho,G}(A)$. This proves our claim that every contagious set $A \subseteq V(C)$ for C also infects $V(C)$ in G.

Since G is connected, the construction of H ensures that H has at most two connected components. Suppose first that H is connected and therefore that $H = C$. Since we assumed that G has no contagious set of size less than $2\rho n$, it follows from our above claim that C has no contagious set of size less than $2\rho n$. Thus $C = H$ is also a counterexample, contradicting the edge-minimality of G. We conclude that H must have exactly two connected components C and C'. Observe that since $d_H(x) = d_G(x) > 1/\rho$ we have that $|V(C)| > 1/(2\rho)$. Suppose now that $|V(C')| \leq 1/(2\rho)$, and let $A \subseteq V(C)$ be a contagious set for C. Then by our above claim A infects $V(C)$ in G, so $V(G) \setminus H_{\rho,G}(A) \subseteq V(C')$. It follows that every vertex $w \in V(G)$ not infected by A has $d_G(w) \leq 1/\rho$, and since G is connected it follows that $H_{\rho,G}(A) = V(G)$. In other words any contagious set for C is also a contagious set for G, and therefore $h_\rho(C) \geq 2\rho|V(C)|$. Thus C is also a counterexample, contradicting the vertex-minimality of G.

We therefore conclude that C and C' each have more than $1/(2\rho)$ vertices. By minimality of G it follows there are contagious sets $A \subseteq V(C)$ and $A' \subseteq V(C')$ for C and C' respectively with $|A| < 2\rho|V(C)|$ and $|A'| < 2\rho|V(C')|$. Then A infects $V(C)$ in G by our above claim. Moreover, A' infects $V(C')$ in G since every vertex $w \in V(C')$ with $w \neq v$ has $N_G(w) = N_{C'}(w)$, and $d_G(v) < 1/\rho$. We conclude that $A \cup A'$ is a contagious set in G of size $|A \cup A'| \leq |A| + |A'| < 2\rho|V(C)| + 2\rho|V(C')| = 2\rho n$, contradicting our assumption that G was a counterexample and so completing the proof of (ii).

Finally, to prove (iii), assume for a contradiction that there exists $v \in V_1$ such that $|N(v) \cap V_2| \geq 1/(2\rho)$, and choose any $w \in N(v) \cap V_2$. Since $G[N(v) \cap V_2]$ is a clique by (ii), every other vertex of $N(v) \cap V_2$ is a neighbour of both v and w. Since each vertex of V_2 will become infected once it has two infected neighbours, it follows that if w is initially infected, then v will become infected at the first time step, and then all remaining vertices of $N(v) \cap V_2$ will become infected at the second time step. So $|H_{\rho,G}(w)| \geq |\{v\} \cup (N(v) \cap V_2)| \geq 1/(2\rho)$, contradicting Claim 2.2. □

We now introduce some further notation. Let M be the number of edges with one endvertex in V_1 and one endvertex in V_2. Also, for each $v \in V(G)$, write $d'(v) := |N(v) \cap V_1|$ and define $x_v := \rho d(v)$ and $y_v := \rho d'(v)$. Note that, by Claim 2.3(i), for

every $v \in V_{\geq 2}$ we have

$$0 \leq y_v < 1/2 \,. \tag{6}$$

Furthermore, double-counting the edges between V_1 and V_2 together with Claim 2.3(iii) gives us

$$\sum_{v \in V_2} y_v = \rho \sum_{v \in V_2} d'(v) = \rho M = \rho \sum_{v \in V_1} |N(v) \cap V_2| < \tfrac{1}{2}|V_1| \,. \tag{7}$$

We now choose an order σ of the vertices of $V_{\geq 2}$ uniformly at random. Let A be the set of vertices $v \in V_{\geq 2}$ for which fewer than $\lceil \rho d(v) \rceil$ neighbours of v precede v in the order σ. We claim that A is a contagious set for G with respect to ρ. Indeed, since G is connected and each vertex of V_1 becomes infected once it has one infected neighbour, it suffices for this to show that A infects V_2. Suppose for a contradiction that this is not the case, and let $v \in V_2$ be the first vertex in the order σ which is not infected by A. Then $v \notin A$, so v has at least $\lceil \rho d(v) \rceil$ neighbours which precede v. Our choice of v implies that all of these neighbours are infected by A, but this contradicts the fact that v is not infected by A. So A is indeed a contagious set for G with respect to ρ. Moreover, for any $v \in V_{\geq 2}$ we have $v \in A$ if and only if v is one of the first $\lceil \rho d(v) \rceil$ members of $\{v\} \cup (N(v) \cap V_{\geq 2})$ in the order σ. It follows that $\mathbb{P}[v \in A] = \frac{\lceil \rho d(v) \rceil}{1 + |N(v) \cap V_{\geq 2}|}$, so the expected size of A is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|A|] &= \sum_{v \in V_{\geq 2}} \frac{\lceil \rho d(v) \rceil}{1 + d(v) - d'(v)} < \sum_{v \in V_{\geq 2}} \frac{1 + \rho d(v)}{d(v) - d'(v)} = \rho \sum_{v \in V_{\geq 2}} \frac{1 + x_v}{x_v - y_v} \\
&= \rho \left(\sum_{v \in V_2} \frac{1 + x_v}{x_v - y_v} + \sum_{v \in V_{\geq 2} \setminus V_2} \frac{1 + x_v}{x_v - y_v} \right) \\
&\overset{(*)}{\leq} \rho \left(\sum_{v \in V_2} \frac{1 + 1}{1 - y_v} + \sum_{v \in V_{\geq 2} \setminus V_2} \frac{1 + 2}{2 - 1/2} \right) \\
&= 2\rho \left(\sum_{v \in V_2} \frac{1}{1 - y_v} + |V_{\geq 2} \setminus V_2| \right) =: T \,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality $(*)$ follows from (6), the fact that $x_v \geq 1$ for $v \in V_2$ and $x_v \geq 2$ for $x \in V_{\geq 2} \setminus V_2$, and the fact that if $0 \leq y < a \leq x$ are real numbers, then $\frac{1+x}{x-y} \leq \frac{1+a}{a-y}$. For the final argument we will use the following claim.

Claim 2.4. *Let $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $K = \{y \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]^{n_2} \mid \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} y_i \leq \frac{n_1}{2}\}$ and $f(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \frac{1}{1-y_i}$. We have that*

$$\max_{y \in K} f(y) \leq n_1 + n_2 \,.$$

Proof. Suppose first that $n_1 \geq n_2$, and let $u := (\frac{1}{2}, \ldots, \frac{1}{2})$. Then $u \in K$, and it is easy to see that $f(u) \geq f(y)$ for every $y \in K$. Furthermore $f(u) = n_2 \cdot \frac{1}{1-1/2} = 2n_2 \leq n_1 + n_2$.

Now suppose instead that $n_1 < n_2$. Since f is a continuous function it attains its maximum on the compact space K. Fix $u \in K$ such that this maximum is attained, and (subject to this) so that as many as possible of the u_i are equal to $1/2$. Clearly we then have $\sum_{i=1}^{n_2} u_i = \frac{n_1}{2}$. Suppose first that there exist distinct $i, j \in [n_2]$ such that

$0 < u_i \leq u_j < 1/2$. Then set $\varepsilon := \min\{u_i, 1/2 - u_j\}$ and define $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ by

$$z_k := \begin{cases} u_i - \varepsilon, \text{ if } k = i \\ u_j + \varepsilon, \text{ if } k = j \\ u_k, \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

Note that $z \in K$. We then get by the convexity of the function $g(x) = \frac{1}{1-x}$ on $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ that

$$f(u) = g(u_i) + g(u_j) + \sum_{k \neq i,j} g(u_k) < g(u_i - \varepsilon) + g(u_j + \varepsilon) + \sum_{k \neq i,j} g(u_k) = f(z) .$$

This contradicts the assumption that $f(u)$ was the maximal value. We therefore conclude that all but at most one of the u_i are equal to 0 or $1/2$; since n_1 is an integer and $\sum_{i=1}^{n_2} u_i = \frac{n_1}{2}$, this implies that in fact every u_i is equal to 0 or $1/2$ (in other words u has n_1 coordinates equal to $1/2$ and the rest equal to 0). Hence $\max_{y \in K} f(y) = f(u) = n_1 \cdot \frac{1}{1-1/2} + (n_2 - n_1) \cdot \frac{1}{1-0} = n_1 + n_2$. □

By setting $n_1 = |V_1|$ and $n_2 = |V_2|$ and by using (6) and (7) the assumptions of Claim 2.4 are fulfilled and we can conclude our calculation with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|A|] < T &\leq 2\rho(|V_1| + |V_2| + |V_{\geq 2} \setminus V_2|) \\ &= 2\rho n . \end{aligned}$$

We may therefore fix an order σ of $V_{\geq 2}$ such that the contagious set A given by this order has size less than $2\rho n$. This contradicts our assumption that G was a counterexample and so proves the theorem. □

2.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.3.** To prove our second main theorem we use the following modified version of a theorem of Gentner and Rautenbach [26]. For a constant $\rho > 0$ and a graph G we again use the notation $V_1 = \{v \in V(G) \mid d(v) \leq 1/\rho\}$ and $V_{\geq 2} = V \setminus V_1$.

Lemma 2.5 ([26])**.** *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\rho_0 > 0$ such that for any $\rho \in (0, \rho_0)$ the following holds. Let G be a connected graph of order n with girth at least 5 and $\Delta(G) \geq 1/\rho$. If $|N(u) \cap V_1| < \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon} d(u)$ for every $u \in V_{\geq 2}$, then*

$$h_\rho(G) < (1 + \varepsilon)\rho n .$$

The form of the lemma given above follows immediately from the proof of the original version [26, Theorem 1], which omitted the condition on the neighbourhood in V_1 of vertices in $V_{\geq 2}$, and had the weaker conclusion that $h_\rho(G) \leq (2 + \varepsilon)\rho n$. Loosely speaking, in this proof Gentner and Rautenbach used a random selection process to select an initial set X and showed that vertices satisfying certain properties are infected with high probability by X. They then bounded the number of vertices which do not have these properties, and simply added all such vertices to X to obtain a contagious set of the claimed size.

More precisely, they first fixed a sufficiently small constant δ, in particular with $\delta < \varepsilon$, and found a set $X_0 \subseteq V_{\geq 2}$ with two properties:

(a) $|X_0| \leq (1 + \delta)\rho n$, and
(b) $|N(u) \cap (V_1 \setminus H_{\rho,G}(X_0))| \leq \frac{1}{1+\delta} d(u)$ for every $u \in V_{\geq 2} \setminus X_0$.

Then, by a series of random selections which exploit the girth property to ensure independence of the random variables considered, they added at most $(1 + \varepsilon - \delta)\rho n$ vertices to X_0 to gain a set $X_0 \subseteq Y \subseteq V(G)$ such that $|Y| \leq (2 + \varepsilon)n$ and $H_{\rho,G}(Y) = V(G)$.

To prove Lemma 2.5 we follow exactly the same argument with $X_0 := \emptyset$; the additional condition of Lemma 2.5 ensures that X_0 satisfies (a) and (b). We then obtain a set $Y \subseteq V(G)$ such that $|Y| \leq (1+\varepsilon-\delta)\rho n < (1+\varepsilon)\rho n$ and $H_{\rho,G}(Y) = V(G)$.

We can now prove Theorem 1.3. The main idea is to show that a minimal counterexample must satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.5, and therefore is not in fact a counterexample.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, let ρ_0 be small enough for Lemma 2.5 and also such that $\rho_0 < \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$, and fix $\rho \in (0, \rho_0)$. Let G be a minimal counterexample according to the number of vertices (for these values of ρ and ε), and let n be the order of G. So G is a connected graph on $n > \frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)\rho}$ vertices with girth at least five and $h_\rho(G) \geq (1+\varepsilon)\rho n$. We may assume that $\Delta(G) > 1/\rho$, as otherwise (since G is connected) we have $h_\rho(G) = 1 < (1+\varepsilon)\rho n$, a contradiction. We show the following claim.

Claim 2.6. *$|N(v) \cap V_1| < \frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)\rho}$ for every $v \in V_{\geq 2}$.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that there exists $v \in V_{\geq 2}$ such that $|N(v) \cap V_1| \geq \frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)\rho}$. Then $|H_{\rho,G}(v)| \geq |\{v\} \cup (N(v) \cap V_1)| > \frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)\rho}$. We set $G' := G - H_{\rho,G}(v)$ and denote by $\mathcal{C}$ the set of connected components of G'. Note first that $\{v\}$ cannot infect $V(G)$, as otherwise $h_\rho(G) = 1 < (1+\varepsilon)\rho n$, a contradiction. Now assume that there is a component $C \in \mathcal{C}$ which contains at most $\frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)\rho}$ vertices. As G is connected there exists a vertex $u \in V(C)$ with a neighbour in $H_{\rho,G}(v)$. Let $m(u) := |N(u) \cap H_{\rho,G}(v)| \geq 1$; since $u \notin H_{\rho,G}(v)$, we derive the inequality

$$\frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)\rho} + m(u) > d(u) > m(u) \cdot \frac{1}{\rho} \, .$$

This leads to

$$1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon} > (1-\rho)m(u) \geq 1 - \rho \geq 1 - \rho_0 \, ,$$

which contradicts our choice of ρ_0. Therefore each connected component of G' contains more than $\frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)\rho}$ vertices. Since G was a minimal counterexample, it follows that each component $C \in \mathcal{C}$ has $h_\rho(C) < (1+\varepsilon)\rho|V(C)|$. By Proposition 2.1 we then have

$$h_\rho(G) \leq 1 + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} h_\rho(C) < (1+\varepsilon)\rho \left(|H_{\rho,G}(v)| + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} |V(C)| \right) = (1+\varepsilon)\rho n \, ,$$

a contradiction. □

So for every vertex $u \in V_{\geq 2}$ we have $|N(u) \cap V_1| < \frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)\rho} < \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon} d(u)$. By Lemma 2.5, it follows that $h_\rho(G) < (1+\varepsilon)\rho n$. This contradicts our assumption that G was a counterexample, and so completes the proof. □

3. Further Remarks

The example of the balanced $(\lfloor 1/\rho \rfloor + 1)$-regular tree in Observation 1.4 shows that Theorem 1.3 is asymptotically best possible; there remains the question of whether it is possible to drop the ε in the statement of Theorem 1.3. Note that the assumption about ρ being sufficiently small is necessary for Theorem 1.3. To see this, choose any $\rho \in (1/2, 3/5)$, and observe that the 5-cycle C_5 then fulfils $h_\rho(C_5) = 3 > \rho n(C_5)$. By contrast Gentner and Rautenbach [26] showed that for every $\rho \in (0, 1]$ and every tree T of order at least $1/\rho$ we have $h_\rho(T) \leq \rho n(T)$. It would also be interesting to know whether Theorem 1.3 remains valid under the weaker assumption that G has girth

at least four (note that Observation 1.1 shows that the girth assumption cannot be dropped altogether).

Recall that the example of the complete graph $K_{\lfloor 1/\rho \rfloor + 2}$ shows that the constant 2 in Theorem 1.2 cannot be improved. However, since that example has order roughly $1/\rho$, there remains the question of whether, for fixed ρ, the optimal bound for graphs on at least n vertices is asymptotically ρn as n tends to infinity. The following construction shows that this is not the case for uncountably-many values of ρ, including values arbitrarily close to zero.

Proposition 3.1. *For every $\rho \in (0, 1/3)$ such that $1/\rho - \lfloor 1/\rho \rfloor > 1/2$ there exists $\varepsilon(\rho) > 0$ such that for every $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a connected graph G of order $n \geq N_0$ with*

$$h_\rho(G) > (1 + \varepsilon)\rho n \, .$$

Proof. Roughly speaking, we use the integrality gap to produce a number of graphs H_i each requiring two vertices to become infected, while containing slightly fewer than $2/\rho$ vertices. We connect these graphs together to a graph G in a way that ensures that even if the whole graph G except one H_i is infected, we then still need at least two additional infected vertices from H_i to infect the vertices in H_i. This ensures that a contagious set must contain at least two vertices from every H_i, while the size of these subgraphs bounds $h_\rho(G)$ away from ρn.

Formally, set $\gamma = 1/\rho - \lfloor 1/\rho \rfloor - 1/2$ and choose $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k > \max\{1/(2\gamma), \rho N_0/2\}$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{\rho(\gamma - 1/(2k))}{1 - \rho(\gamma - 1/(2k))}$. Let A and B be two disjoint sets of $\lfloor 1/\rho \rfloor$ vertices and u be an additional vertex. We define a graph H with vertex set $A \cup B \cup \{u\}$ and edge set $\{\{v, w\} \mid v, w \in B \text{ or } v \in A, w \in B \text{ or } v = u, w \in A\}$. In other words, B is a clique, and we add a complete bipartite graph from A to B and all edges from the vertices of A to u.



FIGURE 1. H when $\lfloor 1/\rho \rfloor = 5$

Let $H_1, \cdots, H_k$ be vertex disjoint copies of H and denote by $u_1, \cdots, u_k$ the vertices corresponding to u. Let s be another additional vertex. We define a graph G to be the union of the H_i and $\{s\}$ with the additional edges $\{\{s, u_i\} \mid i \in [k]\}$. Note that $n = |V(G)| = k|V(H)| + 1 \geq N_0$ and that a contagious set for G contains at least 2 vertices from each H_i. This follows since each vertex in H_i requires two infected neighbours to become infected. The vertex u may gain one infected neighbour if s is infected but to become infected, at least one vertex from A must also be infected. For a vertex from A to become infected, then either two vertices from B must be infected already, or one vertex from B and u must have been previously infected. Equally, no vertex from B can become infected without two infected neighbours from within $A \cup B$. From this we see that only u can become infected without two vertices from H_i being in the contagious set, however the infection of u requires an infected vertex in A and will only lead to the infection of H_i if there was also a vertex infected in B. Thus we

have

$$h_\rho(G) \geq 2k = \frac{2k}{\rho(k|V(H)|+1)}\rho n = \frac{2}{\rho(2\lfloor\frac{1}{\rho}\rfloor+1)+\rho/k}\rho n = \frac{1}{\rho\lfloor\frac{1}{\rho}\rfloor+\rho/2+\rho/2k}\rho n$$
$$= \frac{1}{1-\rho(\gamma-1/(2k))}\rho n = \left(1+\frac{\rho(\gamma-1/(2k))}{1-\rho(\gamma-1/(2k))}\right)\rho n > (1+\varepsilon)\rho n\ .$$

□

It remains possible that for sufficiently small ρ, sufficiently large graphs have contagious sets whose size is close to ρn. We formulate this as the following question.

Question 3.2. *Is it true that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $\rho_0 \in (0,1]$ and $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $\rho \in (0,\rho_0]$ and every $n \geq N_0$ the following holds? If G is a connected graph of order n, then*

$$h_\rho(G) < (1+\varepsilon)\rho n\ .$$

References

[1] Eyal Ackerman, Oren Ben-Zwi, and Guy Wolfovitz. Combinatorial model and bounds for target set selection. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 411(44):4017–4022, 2010.

[2] Michael Aizenman and Joel L. Lebowitz. Metastability effects in bootstrap percolation. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 21(19):3801, 1988.

[3] Hamed Amini and Nikolaos Fountoulakis. What I tell you three times is true: Bootstrap percolation in small worlds. In Paul W. Goldberg, editor, *Internet and Network Economics: 8th International Workshop, WINE 2012, Liverpool, UK, December 10-12, 2012. Proceedings*, pages 462–474. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012.

[4] József Balogh and Béla Bollobás. Bootstrap percolation on the hypercube. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 134(4):624–648, 2006.

[5] József Balogh, Béla Bollobás, Hugo Duminil-Copin, and Robert Morris. The sharp threshold for bootstrap percolation in all dimensions. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 364:2667–2701, 2012.

[6] József Balogh, Béla Bollobás, and Robert Morris. Bootstrap percolation in three dimensions. *The Annals of Probability*, 37(4):1329–1380, 2009.

[7] József Balogh, Béla Bollobás, and Robert Morris. Majority bootstrap percolation on the hypercube. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 18:17–51, 2009.

[8] József Balogh, Béla Bollobás, and Robert Morris. Bootstrap percolation in high dimensions. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 19(5-6):643–692, 2010.

[9] József Balogh, Béla Bollobás, Robert Morris, and Oliver Riordan. Linear algebra and bootstrap percolation. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 119(6):1328 – 1335, 2012.

[10] József Balogh and Gábor Pete. Random disease on the square grid. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 13(3-4):409–422, 1998.

[11] József Balogh and Boris G. Pittel. Bootstrap percolation on the random regular graph. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 30(1-2):257–286, 2007.

[12] Eli Berger. Dynamic monopolies of constant size. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 83:191–200, 2001.

[13] Larry Blume, David Easley, Jon Kleinberg, Robert Kleinberg, and Éva Tardos. Which networks are least susceptible to cascading failures? In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2011 IEEE 52nd Annual Symposium on*, pages 393–402, 2011.

[14] Damon Centola, Víctor M. Eguluz, and Michael W. Macy. Cascade dynamics of complex propagation. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 374(1):449–456, 2007.

[15] Damon Centola and Michael Macy. Complex contagions and the weakness of long ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(3):702–734, 2007.

[16] Raphaël Cerf and Emilio N. M. Cirillo. Finite size scaling in three-dimensional bootstrap percolation. *The Annals of Probability*, 27(4):1837–1850, 1999.

[17] Raphaël Cerf and Francesco Manzo. The threshold regime of finite volume bootstrap percolation. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 101(1):69–82, 2002.

[18] J. Chalupa, P. L. Leath, and G. R. Reich. Bootstrap percolation on a Bethe lattice. *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics*, 12(1):L31–L35, 1979.

[19] Ching-Lueh Chang. Triggering cascades on undirected connected graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, 111(19):973–978, 2011.
[20] Ching-Lueh Chang and Yuh-Dauh Lyuu. Triggering cascades on strongly connected directed graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 593:62–69, 2015.
[21] Amin Coja-Oghlan, Uriel Feige, Michael Krivelevich, and Daniel Reichman. Contagious sets in expanders. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA '15, pages 1953–1987, 2015.
[22] Gennaro Cordasco, Luisa Gargano, Marco Mecchia, Adele A. Rescigno, and Ugo Vaccaro. Discovering small target sets in social networks: A fast and effective algorithm. arXiv:1610.03721.
[23] Michael Dairyko, Michael Ferrara, Bernard Lidický, Ryan R. Martin, Florian Pfender, and Andrew J. Uzzell. Ore and Chvátal-type degree conditions for bootstrap percolation from small sets. arXiv:1610.04499.
[24] Uriel Feige, Michael Krivelevich, and Daniel Reichman. Contagious sets in random graphs. *Annals of Applied Probability*. To appear. arXiv:1602.01751v1.
[25] Daniel Freund, Matthias Poloczek, and Daniel Reichman. Contagious sets in dense graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*. To appear. arXiv:1503.00158v3.
[26] Michael Gentner and Dieter Rautenbach. Dynamic monopolies for degree proportional thresholds in connected graphs of girth at least five and trees. arXiv:1601.02099v2.
[27] Mark Granovetter. Threshold models of collective behavior. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(6):1420–1443, 1978.
[28] Janko Gravner, Christopher Hoffman, James Pfeiffer, and David Sivakoff. Bootstrap percolation on the Hamming torus. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 25(1):287–323, 2015.
[29] Janko Gravner, Alexander E. Holroyd, and Robert Morris. A sharper threshold for bootstrap percolation in two dimensions. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 153(1):1–23, 2012.
[30] Alexander E. Holroyd. Sharp metastability threshold for two-dimensional bootstrap percolation. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 125(2):195–224, 2003.
[31] Svante Janson, Tomasz Łuczak, Tatyana Turova, and Thomas Vallier. Bootstrap percolation on the random graph $G_{n,p}$. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 22(5):1989–2047, 2012.
[32] Paul A. Dreyer Jr. and Fred S. Roberts. Irreversible k-threshold processes: Graph-theoretical threshold models of the spread of disease and of opinion. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 157(7):1615–1627, 2009.
[33] David Kempe, Jon Kleinberg, and Éva Tardos. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *Proceedings of the Ninth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '03, pages 137–146, 2003.
[34] Natasha Morrison and Jonathan A. Noel. Extremal bounds for bootstrap percolation in the hypercube. arXiv:1506.04686v1.
[35] David Peleg. Size bounds for dynamic monopolies. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 86(2):263–273, 1998.
[36] Daniel Reichman. New bounds for contagious sets. *Discrete Mathematics*, 312(10):1812–1814, 2012.
[37] Duncan J. Watts. A simple model of global cascades on random networks. *Physical Sciences - Applied Mathematics*, 99(9):5766–5771, 2002.